

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office Action of Examiner Andrew L. Nalven, dated 23 Feb 2004.

Claims 1-19 are in the case, with claims 1-5, 9, 10, 12 and 13 rejected; and claims 6-8, 11 and 14 objected to but otherwise containing allowable subject matter. Claims 15-19 have been added by this amendment.

Drawings

Applicants include herewith formal drawings for entry in the case subject to the approval of the Examiner.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 has been objected to for the use of the phrase "execute signed lists".

The Examiner is correct. Applicants have amended claim 14 to recite "execute signed agents".

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-5, 9-10, and 12-13 have been rejected under 35
5 U.S.C. 103(a) over McGee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,694,434,
hereinafter McGee) in view of Samar et al (U.S. Patent
6,304,974, hereinafter Samar).

McGee provides a way of augmenting verification of
signatures, and relates to the use of hash values, or
10 secondary identifiers, for determining if a program is
allowed to run.

Samar relates to the distribution of trusted certifiers
through the use of check signatures, or hash marks. That
is, Samar teaches how to use finger prints to get lists of
15 certifiers.

In both McGee and Samar, the pki signature system of
trusted code is augmented. In McGee, signature verification
is provided, and in Samar the distribution of trusted

signatures is provided.

Both McGee and Samar relate to certificates, neither to cross certificates, as is specifically recited in each of applicants claims. Applicants explain what is meant by a cross certificate as follows:

10 "A cross certifier implies as a prerequisite that two certificates 566, 576 exist. Certifiers are foundation security identifiers generated to present a unique key representation of a particular organization (not individual). It is the basis of that organization's digital signature. An organization creates a certifier so that it can electronically sign other elements within a security model. That is a certificate. A cross certificate 566 is a secondary
15 construct that gives enough information to verify the signature of something signed by a certifier. Referring to the example of Figure 9, client side agent task 226 will only execute signed agents 562, 563. Task 226 must be able to verify the signature, so must
20 have a cross certificate 576 that validates the signature to the acceptability level of local services ID 210." [Specification, page 92, lines 4-18.]

 In addition to the above distinction with respect to McGee and Samar, applicants invention provides agent
25 services 226, or containers, that execute agents 562. These are described as follows:

30 "Third party written signed agents 562 are a particularly important aspect of the preferred embodiments of the invention. The client run time includes agent services 226 that executes these agents 526, 563. Agent services 226 has been unbundled and put into the run time, and this requires that the

5 security model be unbundled from the server platform to the run time. Advantages of the present invention include provision for bringing cross certificates 576 down to the client for multiple users, and provision for unionized group lists 572, 575." [Specification, page 97, lines 1-10.]

The relationship between these agent services, or containers, 226 and cross certificates is brought out in the following:

10

15 "In step 518, agent service 226 is activated to execute agent 562 in restricted or unrestricted mode dependent upon successful comparison of the signature in agent 562 to a cross certificate 576 and corresponding authority. This step includes the following. Agent code 226 determines if an agent 562 is supposed to execute on event or schedule, and then checks the signature on the agent, looks to compare if there is a matching downloaded cross certificate 576, and will not proceed if there is a mismatch or no locatable cross certificate. After verifying that the signature in agent code 562 can be authenticated, it checks group lists 572 to determine the type of execution the authenticated signatory is permitted: 25 restricted or unrestricted." [Specification, page 97, lines 11-24.]

Neither McGee nor Samar teach the concept of agent services 226.

30 Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite the container, or agent services 226. These containers are activated in response to successful comparison of the signature in the agent to a cross certificate and corresponding authority.

Applicants request that the rejections of claims 1-5,
9, 10, 12 and 13 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-8, 11, and 14 have been objected to as
5 depending from rejected base claims, but otherwise
allowable.

Applicants have introduced claims 15-19 corresponding
to claims 6-8, 11, and 14, respectively, and including the
limitations of their respective base and any intervening
10 claims.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered
and the case passed to issue with claims 1-19.

The Application is believed to be in condition for
15 allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should
differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of

the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P.

5 Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the Application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Sincerely,

10

C. J. Kraenzel, et al.

By


Shelley M. Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

15

Date: 21 June 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law

61 Glenmont Road
Woodlawn, VA 24381-1341

20

Phone: (276) 238-1972
Fax: (276) 238-1545